



An English Version of Some Events in Bohemia during 1434

Author(s): A. N. E. D. Schofield

Source: *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 42, No. 99 (Jun., 1964), pp. 312-331

Published by: the [Modern Humanities Research Association](#) and [University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4205564>

Accessed: 15/06/2014 18:35

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Modern Humanities Research Association and University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Slavonic and East European Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

An English Version of Some Events in Bohemia During 1434

A. N. E. D. SCHOFIELD

I

WESTERN Manuscript 0.9.38 in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, is a commonplace book from Glastonbury Abbey compiled by various hands in the 15th and 16th centuries.¹ Folios 77a–78b of this manuscript contain a copy of a letter written by Nicholas Frome, abbot of Glastonbury, on 9 June 1434.² The text is given below.³ The letter is not, as M. R. James stated in his catalogue, concerned with the proceedings of the Council of Basel.⁴ Frome, who was writing to members of his community from Cologne while on his way to the Council of Basel, devoted much of his letter to an account of recent events in Bohemia. He had not been in Bohemia and his narrative was based, presumably, on the latest news reaching him in Cologne; but his letter has such a wealth of interesting detail that it is of value for comparison with other available sources for the same events. He was also using, to some extent, a copy of a report—which he cites towards the end of his letter—made in Basel on 28 May 1434 by John of Palomar, the papal auditor who had just returned from a mission to the Bohemian borderlands on behalf of the Council;⁵ this apparently is no longer extant and its contents can be gleaned, otherwise, only from the very brief summaries given by Cardinal John of Segovia in his history of the Council and by an anonymous diarist of the Council.⁶ The abbot's letter is of further interest in the context of England's relations with the Council

¹ M. R. James, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge*, Cambridge, 1900–4, iii, (1902), pp. 495, 501.

² On Frome, who was abbot from 1420 until his death in 1456, see A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, Oxford 1958, II, p. 730.

³ *Infra*, pp. 328–31. I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to the Master and Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge, for permission to publish the text of this manuscript.

⁴ James, *op. cit.*, p. 501, where the date of the letter is given as 1433; concerning this error, see *infra* p. 323. The same date occurs again in Emden, *op. cit.*, II, p. 730, where the name of one of the addressees (which is the only one to have survived in the manuscript) is given as John (instead of Richard) Busard; cf. *infra* p. 328 line 1.

⁵ J. Haller (ed.), *Die Protokolle des Concils von 1434 und 1435, Concilium Basiliense. Studien und Quellen zur Geschichte des Concils von Basel*, Basel, 1896–1936, III, (1900), p. 109.

⁶ *Historia gestorum synodi Basiliensis in Monumenta Conciliorum Generalium Saeculi XV. Concilium Basiliense. Scriptores*, edited by F. Palacký, etc. Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna 1857–86, II, (1873), p. 673; *Tagebuchzeichnungen 1431–1435 und 1438*, edited by G. Beckmann, in *Concilium Basiliense V*, (1904), p. 92.

of Basel, as an illustration of the English attitude towards the Hussites and especially towards the Council's negotiations with the latter.⁷

II

The background to the events reported by Frome can be summarised briefly as follows. Since the beginning of the Hussite wars in 1420 the repeated and sensational victories of the far-ranging Hussite armies had caused many to see the only firm hope for the peace and security of much of Christendom in negotiations for some form of settlement with the Bohemian heretics. A new anti-Hussite crusade, led by Frederick of Hohenzollern, elector of Brandenburg, and the papal legate, Cardinal Julian Cesarini, was routed at Domažlice (Taus) on 14 August 1431, and it proved to be the last of these campaigns. Cesarini, who was also president of the General Council then assembling in Basel, henceforth exerted himself to obtain as much support as possible for the Council which now entered into negotiations with the Bohemians. Eventually there arrived in Basel, early in 1433, an embassy from Bohemia representative of the various groups within the Hussite movement and prepared to debate an agreed version of the 'Four Articles,' the distinctive tenets of Hussitism, with the Council's spokesmen. The 'Four Articles'—declaring that the Eucharist should be administered in both kinds to the faithful; that the word of God should be freely, publicly and truthfully preached by those whose concern it was to do so; that civil dominion should be removed from the clergy; and that public and more notable sins should be suppressed through the exercise of lawful power by the faithful people—were thereafter examined against scriptural and patristic authority until, early in April, the Hussites returned to Prague taking with them some members of the Council, notably Philibert of Montjeu, bishop of Coutances, and John of Palomar, who conducted further negotiations there until August. The Council's envoys were again active in Prague in the autumn of 1433 and they did not leave until early in the following year. In the course of these several stages of negotiation the Council's representatives were not slow to note the extent to which the Hussites were divided among themselves and to which they varied accordingly in their interpretations of the 'Four Articles'. They saw that although there might be virtually no possibility of an agreement with the more extreme groups, the Taborites and Orphans,

⁷ On English policy towards, and relations with, the Council, during 1432-3, see → A. N. E. D. Schofield, 'The First English Delegation to the Council of Basel' (*The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XII, 2, London, 1961, pp. 167-96).

there would be no great difficulty in coming to terms with the Utraquists whose chief demand was for communion in both kinds for the laity;⁸ and before the end of 1433 an informal agreement was reached between the Council and the most moderate Hussites, led by Jan Přebor of Prague University. The practice of administering the chalice to the laity in the Eucharist was to be permitted in the kingdom of Bohemia while assent was also given to the other three Hussite articles, which were now interpreted in so mild a form as to be acceptable to the Church. But this agreement was opposed by the Taborites and Orphans and was not approved by the Bohemian Diet. During the latter part of 1433 and the beginning of 1434, however, a strong movement in favour of peace developed among the aristocracy of Bohemia and Moravia. The Hussite lords—most of whom tended towards Utraquism—had become alarmed at the revolutionary religious and social views propagated by the extreme Hussites, at the growth of lawlessness in the country, particularly as exemplified in the unruly behaviour of the Taborite–Orphan armies which had been besieging Plzeň (Pilsen) under Prokop, the Hussite military leader,⁹ since the summer of 1433. While they were in Bohemia, the conciliar representatives played on the anxieties of the nobles and encouraged them to reassert their influence. The Estates now elected, as regent of the kingdom, Aleš Vřeštovský (of Riesen-berg), a member of an eminent family who had been an Orphan but now wished to see peace and order restored. They accordingly entrusted him with wide powers and a league was formed by both Catholic and Utraquist nobles to enforce his authority; this was joined by the Old Town (Staré Město) of Prague, by the besieged city of Plzeň and the town of Melník. The nobles also made plans to relieve Plzeň in co-operation with Albert, duke of Austria, and with financial support from the Council of Basel. Early in May 1434, some of the league's forces marched to the Old Town of Prague with the assistance of whose citizens they successfully launched an attack on the adjacent New Town (Nové Město) of Prague, a strong centre of Taborite sympathies and support. The news of the New Town's capture by the league caused the armies round Plzeň to withdraw in the direction of Prague. In the succeeding weeks the opposing sides marshalled their forces and at the battle of Lipany, near

⁸ The Taborites acquired their name from the biblical name of Tabor which they gave to their chief settlement in southern Bohemia. After the death, in 1424, of the Hussite leader, Jan Žižka, his followers, who were less radical than the rest of the Taborites, called themselves Orphans. The Utraquists were so-called because of their insistence on communion '*sub utraque specie*' for all; they were also known as Calixtines because they demanded the chalice (*calix*) for the laity.

⁹ Prokop, known as '*Holý*', or '*Rasus*', meaning clean-shaven (in contrast to the Taborite priests who customarily grew beards), is sometimes called 'the Bald'; he is also known as 'the Great' to distinguish him from Prokop the Less (Prokopek), the Orphan leader.

Český Brod, on 30 May the Taborites and Orphans were crushed by the Utraquists and Catholics.¹⁰

Of these events, Frome's narrative is concerned with the formation of the league by the lords, with the capture of the New Town and with the consequent raising of the siege of Plzeň. The chief sources of the period with which his account can be compared are: the *Chronicon veteris Collegiati Pragensis*;¹¹ the continuations of the chronicles of Přibík Pulkava and Beneš of Hořovice (*Staří letopisové čeští*);¹² the *Kronika* of Bartošek of Drahonice;¹³ the *Chronicon* of Andrew of Ratisbon (Regensburg);¹⁴ the *Chronica Novella* of Hermann Corner;¹⁵ Thomas Ebendorffer's *Diarium gestorum per legatos concilii Basiliensis*;¹⁶ the annals of Zittau;¹⁷ Aeneas Sylvius's *De Bohemorum Origine ac Gestis Historia*;¹⁸ and two works which have already been mentioned above: John of Segovia's history of the Council and the diary of an unidentified person at the Council.¹⁹

III

In his opening passage Frome explains that, in the fourth week after Easter (that is, the week beginning 18 April) or thereabouts,

¹⁰ For authoritative accounts of these events see: F. Palacký, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, Prague 1836-67, III, (1845), iii, pp. 1-169; K. Krofta, 'Bohemia in the Fifteenth Century' in *Cambridge Medieval History*, Cambridge 1911-36, VIII (1936), pp. 65-83; F. Lützow, *The Hussite Wars*, London, 1914, pp. 271-336.

¹¹ *Geschichtschreiber der Hусitischen Bewegung in Böhmen*, edited by K. Höfler, in *Fontes Rerum Austriacarum, Scriptores*, Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, 1855-1904, II (1856), i, pp. 93-4.

¹² *Staří letopisové čeští*, edited by F. Palacký, in *Scriptorum Rerum Bohemicarum*, ed. F. M. Pelcel, etc., Societas Scientiarum Bohemicae, Prague 1783-1829, III (1829), pp. 88-9. This version is the one used in the writing of this paper; but two others—to which I did not have access—have been published:—*Staré Letopisy České z Vratislavského Rukopisu novočeským pravopisem*, edited by F. Šimek, Nákladem Historického Spolku a Společnosti Husova Musea, Prague, 1937, pp. 66-7; *Staré Letopisy České z Rukopisu Křižovnického*, Statní Nakladatelství Krásné Literatury, Hudby a Umění, Prague 1959, pp. 109-10.

¹³ *Kronika Bartoška z Drahonice* edited by J. Goll, in *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum* edited by J. Elmer, etc. Nákladem Nadání Františka Paleckého, Prague, 1873-1932, V (1893), pp. 612-13; see also *Chronicon Bartossii de Drahonice* in *Monumenta Historia Boemiae*, edited by G. Dobner, Prague, 1764-85, I, pp. 184-5.

¹⁴ *Andreas Ratisbonensis Chronicon* in *Corpus Historicum Medii Aevi*, edited by J. G. von Eckhardt, Leipzig, 1723, I, pp. 2165-6.

¹⁵ *Hermann Corneri Chronica Novella* in *Corpus Hist. Medii Aevi*, I, 1337-8.

¹⁶ Edited by E. Birk in *Monumenta Conciliorum* ..., I, p. 736.

¹⁷ In *Scriptores Rerum Lusaticarum*, Görlitz, 1838-70, I, p. 62. The annalist from 1420 to 1437 was Johannes Grott.

¹⁸ In J. Dubravius, *Historia Boiémica*, edited by J. Crato, Frankfurt, 1687, pp. 112-13.

¹⁹ *Monumenta Conciliorum* ..., II, p. 673; *Concilium Basiliense*, V, pp. 91, 92. Some later versions of these events can be found in: J. Dobneck (Cochlaeus), *Historiae Hussitarum*, Mainz, 1549, pp. 275-7; Z. Theobald, *Bellum Hussiticum*, Frankfurt, 1621, p. 156; B. A. Balbin, *Epitome Historica Rerum Bohemicarum seu Boleslaviensis*, Prague, 1677, p. 483; O. Raynaldus, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, Cologne, 1694-1727, XVIII (1694), p. 135; J. Lenfant, *Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites*, Amsterdam, 1731, II, p. 19.

the barons and nobles of Bohemia and Moravia, feeling themselves to be dominated by the common people who were 'stricken by that impious heresy', assembled and went to Albert, duke of Austria. Some of them swore fealty to the duke; others, however, feared that if this became known to the masses, the townsmen might be less inclined towards peace and less trustful of the barons in their dealings with them; these therefore confined themselves for the time being to making a truce with the duke.²⁰

On comparison with other sources this appears to be a fairly accurate summary of developments the exact pattern of which, however, does not always emerge quite clearly elsewhere. It also seems that the date which Frome gives, although it is intended to be approximate, is probably several weeks too late for the events. We know, for example, that at Brno (Brünn), on 4 March 1434, at a meeting presided over by Albert of Austria, the lords of Moravia, both Catholic and Hussite, concluded a peace for five years and formed a league to enforce it.²¹ Some Bohemians participated in this—perhaps by virtue of lands or offices which they held in the margravate. We also know that Palomar, in his report to the Council of Basel at the end of May, described his work during the preceding March and April when he organised military and other aid for Plzeň; he spoke then of his attendance at an assembly, called by the duke of Austria, in the course of which the Moravian barons had offered to recognise the duke as their margrave.²² This meeting might have been held at Cham, in Bavaria, where talks were apparently held during March between the Council's ambassadors and the Bohemian and Moravian barons in order to make plans for action against the Taborites.²³ If, as Palomar stated, the Moravian lords were prepared to accept Albert of Austria as margrave, we would not expect to find that the Bohemian lords had done more than conclude a truce with him or an agreement to accept his aid against the extreme Hussites for they had recently chosen Aleš to govern Bohemia. It is possible, therefore, that in Frome's account those whom he describes as taking oaths of loyalty to Albert were Moravians while those who abstained were Bohemians. According to John of Segovia, Palomar also referred to the Moravian lords'

²⁰ *Infra* p. 328, lines 3–13.

²¹ F. Kurz, *Österreich unter K. Albrecht dem Zweyten*, Vienna, 1835, II, pp. 226–32; A. Pilarz and F. Moravetz, *Moraviae Historia Politica et Ecclesiastica*, Brünn, 1785–6, II (1786), pp. 35–6.

²² 'Transeunteque eo ad ducem Albertum Austrie in certa dieta, que tunc cum eo tenebatur, barones Moravie obtulerunt se ei reddituros marchionatum, excusantes se primo id non factum, ne suspecti apud Bohemos haberentur ...'; *Monumenta Conciliorum* ..., II, p. 581.

²³ *Deutsche Reichstagsakten*, Königliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Munich etc., 1867–1933, XI (Gotha, 1898), p. 190; J. Macek, *The Hussite Movement in Bohemia*, Prague, 1958, p. 90.

fears that the Bohemians might be suspicious of their proffered obedience to Albert.²⁴ It is interesting to see that Frome does not distinguish between Bohemians and Moravians in this respect but names the townsmen—and by implication the poorer urban classes—as the people most likely to be antagonised by the lords' closer ties with the duke. If we can assume that Frome and Palomar were speaking of the same occasion, it may be that we have in Frome's letter a truer rendering of the gist of Palomar's report than is given by John of Segovia. The great majority of towns in Bohemia supported the Taborites but there is evidence that some of them were wavering in their allegiance at this time and the barons no doubt hoped to gain support for their cause from the renegades. There were, however, factors which still militated against this latter trend. The lower classes in the towns had been an important element in the Hussite movement and they had benefited in many places, especially in Bohemia, from the expulsion of the wealthier German-speaking citizens during the Hussite wars. Albert of Austria was a much-hated foe of the more obdurate Hussites and it is easy to understand how news of the lords' newly-formed alliance with him could soon have confirmed many of the town-dwellers in their support for the Taborites and Orphans.²⁵

Little is known of the precise manner in which the Bohemian and Moravian barons made their league for the restoration of peace and order throughout their lands.²⁶ Even the date of the league's creation appears to be nowhere explicitly stated, although it was already in existence by the beginning of April 1434.²⁷ It was, it seems, a separate organisation, and of wider scope, than the league formed principally by the Moravians at Brno early in March. It is noteworthy, therefore, that Frome gives what purports to be an account of the actual formation of the league or, at least, of a significant

²⁴ *Monumenta Conciliorum* ..., II, p. 581. The margravate had been granted to Albert by Sigismund, his father-in-law, in 1423; like Sigismund, who had failed to win acceptance as king of Bohemia, Albert had since then been unsuccessful in trying to subdue the Hussites by force. See B. Bertholz, 'Die Übergabe Mährens an Herzog Albrecht V von Österreich im Jahre 1423' (*Archiv für Österreichische Geschichte*, LXXX, 2, Vienna, 1894, pp. 251–349).

²⁵ See Krofta in *Camb. Med. Hist.*, VIII, p. 86; Macek, pp. 83, 87–8, 94–5; R. R. Betts, 'Correnti religiose nazionali ed ereticali dalla fine del secolo XIV alla metà del XV' (*Relazioni del X Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche*, Florence 1955, III, pp. 509–10); on the waning support of some towns for the Taborites at this stage, see the statement of Mikuláš Biskupec of Pelhřimov quoted by Macek, p. 88 (from a longer extract published by F. M. Bartoš in *Časopis společnosti přátel starožitností českých*, XXIX, Prague 1921, p. 113; I am obliged to Akademik Josef Macek for providing me with the reference to this work, which unfortunately I have not been able to consult.)

²⁶ F. Palacký, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, III, iii, p. 156.

²⁷ See the letter, in Czech and dated 9 April 1434, from Sigismund to Oldřich of Rozmberk (Ulrich of Rosenberg), leader of the Catholic party, in *Archiv Český*, edited by F. Palacký, etc., Prague, 1804, I, pp. 37–8; this is also printed (in Latin and with the date as '7 April') in *Die Urkunden Kaiser Sigismunds (1410–1437)*, edited by W. Altmann, (*Regesta Imperii*, XI), Innsbruck, 1896–1900, II (1900), p. 286.

ceremony in its initial stage.²⁸ He tells us that the barons—the same ones who had gone to the duke of Austria—assembled again on the eve of the Ascension (5 May 1434) and bound themselves by mutual oaths to persevere, if necessary at the cost of their lives, until they had subdued the people, who were—as he puts it—so rebellious against the laws of God, the Church and men, and had destroyed the Taborites, Orphans and Utraquists, or had sent them into exile.²⁹ But Frome seems again to have attributed too late a date to the event he is describing. If he is narrating the foundation of the barons' league, then the date should have been at least a month earlier; but, if he is describing merely a final sealing of alliances by the league's members, it is perhaps more likely that this took place only a few days earlier. According to the *Chronicon veteris Collegiati Pragensis*, the league's forces had assembled in the region of Kutna Hora (Kuttenberg) whence they proceeded to the Old Town of Prague, about three days' march away.³⁰ On the basis of the information in this chronicle, it has been estimated that these forces set out on 2 May³¹ and it would be then rather than just before they entered the Old Town, almost at the end of their journey, that we would expect the oaths to have been taken. It will be noticed that, in the passage referred to above, Frome includes the Utraquists along with the Taborites and Orphans as enemies to be crushed by the league and, if we are to judge by this alone, he did not appreciate that the Utraquists, or many of them, were now in favour of an accommodation with the Council of Basel and of action against the Hussite extremists, and that the barons' league had been formed through the alliance of Utraquists with Catholics.

Frome tells us that on Ascension day (6 May) the lords entered the Old Town of Prague, with whose citizens they had reached an agreement earlier, and that with the citizens they attacked the neighbouring New Town later the same day.³² Most of the chronicles agree concerning this date. The *Chronicon veteris Collegiati Pragensis*, however, which goes into some detail about the circumstances, states that the lords reached the Old Town by way of the Small Side (Malá Strana) of Prague on 5 May and attacked the New Town the next day. It further explains that a dispute had arisen between the two towns of Prague: the New Town, where Prokop and other Taborite leaders were then present, fortified itself against, and tried to attack, the Old Town, whereupon the citizens of the

²⁸ *Infra*, pp. 328–9, line 13—line 18.

²⁹ This appears to be the meaning of the lines referred to in the preceding note.

³⁰ *Fontes Rer. Aust.* II, i, p. 93.

³¹ H. Kuffner, *Bitva na Lipan 30 května 1434*, Český Brod [1899], pp. 10–13; *Husitské vojny v obrazech*, Královské Vinohrady [1908], p. 62.

³² *Infra*, p. 329, lines 19–24.

latter appealed for help to the baron's league.³³ Aeneas Sylvius gives a similar account of the dispute between the two towns.³⁴ The hostile actions of the New Town are recorded in *Staří letopisové češti*, while the annalist of Zittau and Bartošek of Drahonice, in his *Kronika*, say that the New Town was attacked because it refused to accede to the demands of the lords and of the Old Town that it should join them against the Taborite and Orphan armies.³⁵ Frome's description of the New Town—'singulare habitaculum et specialem nidum hereticorum'—looks as though it was the one used by Palomar; John of Segovia's version of Palomar's account contains the phrase 'que nidus erat hereticorum' in the same context and the anonymous diary of the Council of Basel has 'que fuit nidus Hussitarum' when reporting Palomar's words.³⁶

The graphic narrative of the capture of the New Town which Frome sent back to England is equalled for its wealth of information only by a long passage in *Staří letopisové češti*.³⁷ He describes the attack as having been launched so suddenly that the lords and their supporters were in the entrances of the New Town before the gates could be closed against them. Prokop, the Taborite leader, immediately fled, taking with him fourteen horses. The attackers next occupied the gates so that no others were able to escape. Some of the inhabitants, many of them already bloodstained, sought refuge in the town-hall and the stronger houses of the town; others went into the river but very few reached the opposite bank. Meanwhile the attackers kept up an indiscriminate slaughter of old and young, women and children. The Taborite priest, Lupus, who had exerted much influence through his preaching in the New Town, was among the slain. The attackers set fire to the town-hall; some of its occupants were burnt, some threw themselves out and others came out to surrender; of the latter, the chief ones were put to death while the remainder were committed to prison. Those who had found refuge in other houses were similarly dealt with and in this way the New Town was cleared of its extreme Hussites.³⁸

Comparing this description with other sources we find confirmation in most of them that the attack was sudden and heavy. (Ebendorffer states in his *Diarium* that it was made through only one of the gates).³⁹ The precipitate flight of Prokop, in the company of others, is also common to most of the narratives. Frome's detail

³³ *Fontes Rer. Aust.* II, i, p. 93.

³⁴ Dubravius, pp. 112–13.

³⁵ *Scriptores Rer. Lusat.*, I, p. 62; *Scriptorium Rer. Bohem.*, III, pp. 88–9; *Fontes Rer. Bohem.*, V, p. 612.

³⁶ *Monumenta Conciliorum ...*, II, p. 673; *Concilium Basiliense*, V, p. 92.

³⁷ *Scriptorium Rer. Bohem.*, III, pp. 88–9.

³⁸ *Infra*, p. 329, line 26—line 46.

³⁹ *Monumenta Conciliorum ...*, I, p. 736.

about the fourteen horses accompanying Prokop is also to be found in the anonymous diary, referred to above,⁴⁰ and in both instances it has probably been copied directly from Palomar. The annalist of Zittau and the narrative in *Staří letopisové češti* include Jakub Vlk ('Lupus' in Frome's letter) among those who escaped.⁴¹ Aeneas Sylvius agrees with this⁴² and according to other evidence Vlk was killed soon afterwards at the battle of Lipany.⁴³ Segovia's summary of Palomar's report⁴⁴ and Andrew of Ratisbon's *Chronicon*⁴⁵ both agree with Frome concerning the many deaths through drowning among those who tried to swim the river Vltava (Moldau). The town-hall is mentioned briefly by Ebendorffer as a place reached by the attackers.⁴⁶ From *Staří letopisové češti*, however, we learn that it was looted but not burnt. (This version states that only one house in the New Town was burnt).⁴⁷ Palomar also spoke of resistance at the town-hall but appears to have said that its defenders, on surrendering, were sent away or allowed to disperse.⁴⁸ Frome's description of a massacre of inhabitants of the New Town is similar to a passage by Hermann Corner in his *Chronica Novella*: '... percusserunt eos in furore suo a maximo usque ad minimum, et nec pepercit gladius fidelium mulieribus aut parvulis, nec aetati aut sexui, sed omnes inventos in ea vita privavit.'⁴⁹ Nowhere else, however, is there anything in the same strain. Bartošek of Drahonice states that the attackers 'cruelly struck' the New Town but then records merely that they killed certain of the citizens.⁵⁰ The annalist of Zittau says that scarcely fourteen people from both sides were killed in the encounter and in *Staří letopisové češti* the total is given as between sixteen and twenty.⁵¹

⁴⁰ *Concilium Basiliense*, V, p. 92.

⁴¹ *Scriptores Rer. Lusat.*, I, p. 62, *Scriptorum Rer. Bohem.*, III, p. 89.

⁴² Dubravius, p. 112.

⁴³ *Concilium Basiliense*, V, p. 94; *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, edited by J. D. Mansi, Florence etc., 1759–1927, XXIX (Venice 1788), pp. 639–40; XXX (Venice 1792), pp. 830–1. All these sources state that the Hussite priest, Lupus, was slain at Lipany. This is also stated in two English chronicles of the 15th century: *Incerti Scriptoris Chronicon Angliae de regnis Henrici IV, Henrici V, et Henrici VI*, edited by J. A. Giles, London, 1848, p. 14; *A Chronicle of London (1089–1483)*, edited by E. Tyrell and Sir H. Nicolas, London 1827, p. 120. (These English sources also record, erroneously, that the English Wyclifite, Peter Payne, had been—according to one—killed, or—according to the other—captured, at Lipany; cf. Emden, *An Oxford Hall in Mediaeval Times*, Oxford, 1927, p. 159.)

⁴⁴ *Monumenta Conciliorum* ... , II, p. 673.

⁴⁵ *Corpus Hist. Medii Aevi*, I, pp. 2165–6.

⁴⁶ *Monumenta conciliorum*, I, p. 736.

⁴⁷ *Scriptorum Rer. Bohem.*, III, p. 89; cf. V. V. Tomek, *Dějepis Města Prahy*, Prague, 1855–1901, IV (1899), pp. 634–5.

⁴⁸ Unless Segovia's words: '... et qui se fortificaverant in pretorio, tradentes se fuerant dimissi' should be taken as meaning that on surrendering they were 'despatched', in the sense of 'put to death'; on the other hand, he had used 'dimittere' in a sense different from this only a few lines previously: '... dimiserant libere abire Procopium rasum aliosque avisatos;' *Monumenta Conciliorum* ... , II, p. 673.

⁴⁹ *Corpus Hist. Medii Aevi*, I, pp. 1337–8.

⁵⁰ *Fontes Rer. Bohem.*, V, pp. 612–13.

⁵¹ *Scriptores Rer. Lusat.*, I, p. 62; *Scriptorum Rer. Bohem.*, III, p. 88.

Some other narratives include a few notable incidents during the capture of the New Town, which Frome does not mention; these are: the firing of a gun from the Old Town and the consequent damage to the bell and tower of the church of Our Lady of the Snow in the New Town; the victors' disarming of the New Town; their destruction of its rights and privileges and their capture of the accumulated loot or treasure of the Taborites and Orphans.⁵²

From the collation of the several versions used above it seems reasonable to infer that the New Town was captured through a well-planned, swift and powerful attack which caused little bloodshed.⁵³ The plan of the attackers was probably to expel, capture or kill the leading extremists together with their more truculent supporters and, when the New Town had thus ceased to be a Taborite-Orphan centre, to leave it firmly under the control of the moderate citizens of the Old Town while the forces of the barons' league moved off to seek battle with the main forces of the Taborites and Orphans.

Yet the abbot of Glastonbury seems to have been predisposed to accept reports telling of a thorough and violent suppression of the New Town. His exaggeration can be partly explained, perhaps, as the exuberance of a distant observer in being able to report a reverse for the Czech heretics after they had long enjoyed a reputation for invincibility. (That this was a victory not of an anti-Hussite crusade but largely of one group of Hussites against another need not invalidate this explanation for, as we have seen, the writer's insight into the Bohemian situation was limited and he had failed to appreciate the position of the Utraquists in opposition to the other Hussites). But the abbot's attitude was also characteristic of the English attitude to the Hussites and to the Council of Basel's dealings with them. The small English delegation, consisting of royal ambassadors and delegates of the clergy of the realm, which reached Basel late in February 1433, had been sent primarily to be present during the Council's debates with the Hussites' representatives on the 'Four Articles'.⁵⁴ During these debates, as had been anticipated, no doubt, in England, Wyclif's teachings were frequently cited and the extent of his influence on the Hussites was repeatedly indicated. It was, then, clearly desirable that some of the great heretic's fellow-countrymen should be present to demonstrate their orthodoxy.

⁵² *Scriptorum Rer. Bohem.*, III, pp. 88–9; *Corpus Hist. Medii Aevi*, I, 1337–8; *Scriptores Rer. Lusat.*, I, p. 62.

⁵³ Bartošek of Drahonice, for instance, speaks of the lords' army as comprising about 12,000 men, both mounted and on foot, *Fontes Rer. Bohem.*, V, pp. 612–3. B. A. Balbin, *Epitome Historica Rerum Bohemicarum*, p. 483, considers that the evidence of contemporary writers indicates only a small loss of life in the taking of the New Town; the explanation was to be found, he thinks, in the speed of the attack (the speed of the attack being perhaps explained, in turn, by the fact that it was carried out mainly by mounted men).

⁵⁴ Schofield, *loc. cit.* pp. 173, 179.

From the first, however, the English were not in sympathy with the conciliatory attitude maintained by the Council. Probably it was not known in England before the delegation set out that Peter Payne, the exiled English Wyclifite, would go to Basel from Bohemia as one of the Hussite ambassadors; although, if news had already been received of the prominent part he was playing in Hussite affairs, the possibility might have been envisaged.⁵⁵ Payne's attendance at Basel, however, was a cause of much annoyance to the English and ensured their indifference or even hostility to the Council's work in connection with the Hussites. John Keninghale, the English Carmelite Provincial, who was one of the first Englishmen to reach the Council, had already clashed publicly with Payne before the English delegation made its appearance. Peter Pertrich, the chancellor of Lincoln, became Payne's chief antagonist among the English after the arrival of the delegation and, on 6 April 1433, he and Keninghale charged Payne with heresy and treachery and unsuccessfully demanded his extradition.⁵⁶ When, in the latter part of 1433, the king's council was planning to send a delegation to Basel for the second time, it sought the opinion of the Convocation of Canterbury on several points concerning the validity of the papal dissolution of the General Council, the validity of Eugenius IV's position as pope, and the Council's procedure. When answering these questions, Convocation added a strong warning about the damage that might be done to the Church's authority if concessions were made to the Hussites in relation to any of their 'Four Articles' with the intention of procuring their return to the Church.⁵⁷ If we consider Frome's letter against this background, it does not appear surprising that he should have classed the Utraquists with the Taborites and Orphans as heretics to be annihilated or that he should, perhaps, have been eager to describe a heavy-handed suppression of the New Town of Prague.

In the next part of his letter Frome deals with the raising of the

⁵⁵ For a summary of Payne's rôle among the Bohemians see E. F. Jacob, 'The Bohemians at the Council of Basel', in *Prague Essays*, edited by R. W. Seton-Watson, Oxford, 1949, p. 88, and Emden, *An Oxford Hall in Mediaeval Times*, pp. 157-8.

⁵⁶ Schofield, *loc. cit.* pp. 179-80, 183; Emden, 149-53; *Liber Diurnus Petri Zatecensis*, edited by F. Palacký, *Monumenta Conciliorum* ... I, pp. 335, 343-4; *Concilium Basiliense*, II, p. 381; V, pp. 48-9.

⁵⁷ *The Register of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury (1414-1443)*, edited by E. F. Jacob, Oxford, 1943-7, III (1945), 243-9. Detailed instructions for the second delegation to Basel were issued under the great seal on 31 May 1434; they contained, however, no reference to the Council's negotiations with the Hussites; *The Official Correspondence of Thomas Bekynton*, edited by G. Williams, Rolls Series, London, 1872, II, pp. 260-9. It is possible that by this date the king's council was correctly informed about the Bohemian situation and, understanding the significance of the moderate Hussites' provisional agreement with the Council of Basel in the winter of 1433-4 and of the aristocracy's moves to restore peace, realised that Convocation's warning was irrelevant. But it is unlikely that news of the league's capture of the New Town of Prague had reached England so much in advance of Frome's letter.

siege of Plzeň which the Taborite-Orphan armies had maintained for eleven months. When the besiegers—according to Frome they numbered ten thousand—heard of the lords' capture of the New Town of Prague they immediately burnt their tents and defences and retreated in disorder. This took place on the Sunday after the Ascension (9 May 1434). It was thought that, if there had been two hundred horsemen at hand, very many of the enemy might have been struck down, but there were then only two horses left in Plzeň. Although in the course of the siege a total of no more than six citizens of Plzeň had been killed, there had been numerous casualties among the besieging armies.⁵⁸

The sources consulted above⁵⁹ contain references, mostly very brief, to the lifting of the siege. Bartošek of Drahonice is alone in placing the event on 8, instead of 9 May; he also adds the detail that the besiegers, in setting fire to their camp, burnt with it (presumably through negligence resulting from the haste in which they retreated) many sick and wounded.⁶⁰ In Frome's account the information about the survival of only two horses in Plzeň appears to have been taken directly from Palomar's report.⁶¹ What he has to say of the treatment meted out to some Hussites who were sent to preach their doctrines to the people of Plzeň—some were burnt and others were sent back with their hands cut off and their eyes plucked out—is also similar to an incident, which is only slightly less horrific, recorded by Segovia (not, however, in his summary of Palomar's report): when the Hussites sent back to Plzeň two of its citizens whose hands they had cut off, the town's defenders inflicted the same treatment on three of their Hussite prisoners and sent them back to the besiegers' camp.⁶²

Having completed his description of these events in Prague and Plzeň, Frome states that they occurred round the feast of the Ascension; but the year is given in this manuscript (which is the only extant copy of his letter) as 1433;⁶³ presumably this is an error on the part of the copyist for it is beyond doubt that these events took place in 1434. Frome also cites Palomar's report to a general congregation of the Council of Basel on 28 May and, in this instance also, we know that the year should be 1434, not 1433.⁶⁴ Palomar's account probably formed the basis of much that Frome wrote home

⁵⁸ *Infra*, pp. 329–30, line 47—line 64.

⁵⁹ See p. 315. Some documents of interest in relation to these events have also been printed in *Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hussitenkrieges von Jahre 1419 an*, edited by F. Palacký, Prague, 1873, II, pp. 411–12. See also, *Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentorum Historicum, Dogmaticorum Moraliū Amplissima Collectio*, edited by E. Martène and U. Durand, Paris, 1724–33, VIII (1733), pp. 716–17; *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, edited by J. D. Mansi, XXIX, pp. 638–40; XXX, pp. 828–9; *Concilium Basiliense*, III, pp. 92, 101; *Monumenta Conciliorum* ... , II, pp. 432, 437–8, 517–19.

⁶⁰ *Fontes Rer. Bohem.*, V, p. 613.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 581.

⁶² *Concilium Basiliense*, III, p. 109.

⁶³ *Infra* p. 330, line 65.

⁶⁴ *Monumenta Conciliorum* ... , II, p. 673.

about Bohemian affairs yet, as we have seen above, he seems to have embellished his narrative from other, less reliable, reports. The erroneous date in the manuscript misled M. R. James into ascribing Frome's letter to 1433; the mention of the general congregation of 28 May also caused him to write—after, it would seem, a very cursory examination—that Frome's letter was 'on the proceedings of the Council of Basle'.⁶⁵

Frome had been appointed to go to Basel in 1433 as one of a supplementary group to the first English delegation but this planned reinforcement was never sent.⁶⁶ When, early in 1434, arrangements were begun for sending a new delegation, Frome was again included. In preparation for his journey abroad he was granted letters of protection on 28 April, letters of attorney on the same date and again on 8 May; and on 15 May a licence to take out of the country gold and silver to the value of one thousand marks.⁶⁷ In the wording of official documents, issued for the members of the two English delegations to the Council of Basel, there is usually a clear differentiation between those who were royal ambassadors and those who were representatives of the Church within the king's realm, although sometimes a person enjoyed a double status, belonging to both categories at the same time.⁶⁸ But the second delegation differed from the first in that all of its more important members ultimately had the status of royal ambassadors.⁶⁹ At an early stage of the second delegation's recruitment Frome and the abbots of Fountains and of St Mary's, York, appear to have been included simply as representatives of the clergy (or religious);⁷⁰ later, however, all three were also appointed royal ambassadors. Frome's name is to be seen in the two, almost identical, procurations for the royal ambassadors issued under the great seal on 31 May and 3 June respectively;⁷¹ and it occurs again in the procuration

⁶⁵ James, III, p. 501.

⁶⁶ Schofield, *loc. cit.* pp. 184–5.

⁶⁷ *Foedera, Conventiones, literae et cuiuscumque generis acta publica*, etc., edited by T. Rymer, The Hague, 1739–45, V (1741), i, pp. 5, 9; *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Henry VI*, [Public Record Office] London, 1896–1910, II (1907), p. 345.

⁶⁸ Schofield, *loc. cit.* p. 167, note 4; see also *Foedera, Conventiones*, V, i, 1–11 *passim*; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, II, pp. 337–45 *passim*.

⁶⁹ This can be seen by checking the names of persons to be found in the pages (indicated in the preceding note) of *Foedera, Conventiones* and the *Calendar of Patent Rolls* against those occurring in the several procurations for royal ambassadors cited in n. 71 *infra*.

⁷⁰ *Foedera, Conventiones*, V, i, pp. 5, 8, 9; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, II, 341, 345. When Frome was issued with a licence to take gold and silver abroad, on 13 May 1434, he was described as follows: 'qui ad praesens, de Licencia nostra, ad Concilium Generale Basiliense, in Ambassata nostra et pro Clero Regni nostri Angliae, profecturus est'; it thus appears that he was already intended to have the double status of royal ambassador and clerical representative.

⁷¹ British Museum, Cotton MS. Cleopatra E III, f. 65; *The Official Correspondence of Thomas Bekynton*, II, p. 259; *Foedera, Conventiones*, V, i, p. 9; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, II, p. 342. In a letter to the Council, dated 20 May 1434, Henry VI gives a slightly different list of ambassadors he intended to send; the abbot of Glastonbury appears in this as 'Michael' but the text as printed in *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, XXIX, p. 1234, contains a number of mis-spellings.

entered on the French Rolls which was dated 10 July and contained the additional names of the three royal ambassadors from Normandy.⁷²

Frome says that he is writing his letter on the feast of SS. Primus and Felician (9 June) from Cologne where for eight days he has been waiting for the rest of the English delegation ('dominos subsequentes'). He says that, if they had already come, he might by now have been in the Council.⁷³ We know, however, that the delegation did not reach Basel until 5 August,⁷⁴ so that he probably had to wait still longer in Cologne. We also know that the bishop of Rochester, who was one of the delegation, did not set off until 18 June—nine days after Frome wrote his letter—and this may have been the day on which the main body of the delegation began its journey.⁷⁵ Frome mentions the war between the dukes of Guelders and of Berg and describes the perilous situation in which he consequently found himself on the way to Cologne, even though safe-conducts had been issued for the living and the dead.⁷⁶ A long-drawn contest followed the death in 1423 of Reinald IV, duke of Julich and Guelders, leaving no heir. Sigismund invested Adolf of Berg with Guelders, despite the fact that the rival claimant, Arnold of Egmont, had been accepted by the inhabitants of Guelders as their ruler. In 1431 Sigismund had placed Arnold under the imperial ban and he afterwards tried to enlist the support of both the pope and the Council of Basel for his campaign against Arnold. Although the Council was taking steps during 1434 to bring about a settlement of the dispute, the quarrel continued for some years more.⁷⁷ Frome therefore—before he has even completed his journey to Basel—expresses anxiety as to how he will make his way home.⁷⁸ On 22 October he took the oath of incorporation in the Council, together with the other members of the English delegation.⁷⁹ Towards the

⁷² *Foedera, Conventiones*, V, i, p. 12; 'Calendar of French Rolls' in *48th Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records*, London, 1887 (12 Henry VI, membrane 2).

⁷³ *Infra*, p. 330, lines 71–3; lines 83–4.

⁷⁴ For the arrival of the English on that date, see: *Studien und Dokumente zur Geschichte der Jahre 1431–1437*, edited by J. Haller, *Concilium Basiliense*, I, p. 87; *Ibid.*, III, p. 165; V, p. 99; *Monumenta Conciliorum*, II, p. 726.

⁷⁵ See the fragment of a diary of the English delegation, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. latin 1448 ('Codex Sprever'), ff. 156a–6b, printed by Zellfelder, pp. 256–9; see, in particular, p. 256.

⁷⁶ *Infra*, p. 330, lines 73–7. His comment that the dangers of the situation made it necessary to trust, after God, to bows and arrows, perhaps indicates that the abbot already had a bodyguard with him. Certainly, when the delegation reached its destination it was accompanied by many archers; according to John of Segovia there were nearly a hundred and fifty; *Monumenta Conciliorum* ... , II, p. 726; see also *Concilium Basiliense*, III, p. 165.

⁷⁷ P. J. Blok, *History of the People of the Netherlands* (English translation), New York, 1899, II, pp. 87–95; *Die Urkunden Kaiser Sigismunds*, II, pp. 315, 336; *Concilium Basiliense*, III, pp. 114–214 *passim*; *Deutsche Reichstagsakten*, XI, pp. 470–8.

⁷⁸ *Infra*, p. 330, lines 80–1.

⁷⁹ Zellfelder, p. 261 (authenticated account of the incorporation of the English ambassadors, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MS. latin 1448 'Codex Sprever', ff. 86–7); *Concilium Basiliense*, III, p. 233; V, p. 105; *Monumenta Conciliorum* ... , II, pp. 765–6.

end of October he was one of five proctors of the archbishop of Canterbury associated with a declaration, which was issued at Basel setting forth the archbishop's case against the Council in a dispute concerning the archdeaconry of Canterbury.⁸⁰ After this, however, Frome cannot be traced at the Council and his name was not included among those of the royal ambassadors for whom a new procuration was issued on 10 February 1435.⁸¹ It is possible, then, that his stay in Basel was brief and that he left again before the end of 1434 or early in 1435.

The abbot reports that the emperor is in Ulm and the supreme pontiff in Rome;⁸² the remaining lines of his letter are devoted to some instructions, exhortations and greetings to the brethren of his community.⁸³ It is not possible to discern the exact significance of his references to the bishop of Bath ('dominus meus singularissimus dominus Bathoniensis') and Lord Hungerford.⁸⁴

When Frome wrote his letter in Cologne on 9 June, more than a month had already elapsed since the Bohemian events which he was describing. The Council had heard of these happenings as early as 19 May⁸⁵ and on 28 May Palomar had delivered his report at Basel in person.⁸⁶ Frome, in Cologne, had been able to learn the contents, and probably to obtain the text, of this report by 9 June. It is interesting, however, to find that he was still, it seems, ignorant on that date of an event far surpassing in importance the capture of the New Town of Prague and the besiegers' retreat from Plzeň: the battle of Lipany, on 30 May, at which the strength of the Taborites and Orphans was finally broken. The news of Lipany was available in Nuremberg on 3 June⁸⁷ and was received in Basel by

⁸⁰ Zellfelder, pp. 306–9 (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, MS. latin 1448, 'Codex Sprever', 83); see also *ibid.* pp. 120–9, 297–306.

⁸¹ *Foedera, Conventiones*, V, 1, p. 15; this was read in the Council on St George's day, 23 April 1434; *Concilium Basiliense*, V, p. 127.

⁸² *Infra*, p. 330, lines 82–3.

⁸³ *Infra*, pp. 330–1, lines 87–106. Frome's recommendation (*infra*, p. 330, lines 94–6) to the monks at Glastonbury that, if they wished to send anything to him, they should use the services of 'Alexander de Albertinis', in London, is interesting in the light of an entry on the Close Rolls dated 6 February 1434: an order for one Bartholomew Albertyn, of the fellowship of the Albertini, to take gowns, and lengths of cloth without payment of custom or subsidy, to Thomas Brouns, dean of Salisbury, one of the royal ambassadors at Basel; *Calendar of Close Rolls, Henry VI*, [Public Record Office], London 1933–41, II (1933), p. 269.

⁸⁴ *Infra*, p. 330, lines 98–102. These lines appear to mean that, if the bishop of Bath or Lord Hungerford visited the monks, the latter should welcome them to the best of their ability and that, if more important persons came, they should send for advice to Hungerford as quickly as possible. The bishop of Bath and Wells was John Stafford, who was also chancellor of England from 1432 to 1450. Walter, Baron Hungerford had been treasurer of England from 1427 until 1432 and in 1435 went with the English embassy to the Congress of Arras.

⁸⁵ *Concilium Basiliense*, V, p. 91.

⁸⁶ *Monumenta Conciliorum* ... , II, p. 673; *Concilium Basiliense*, III, p. 109; V, pp. 91, 92.

⁸⁷ *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, XXIX, pp. 639–40; XXX, pp. 830–1.

7 June;⁸⁸ it must, surely, have reached Cologne very soon after Frome wrote his letter.

The heavy losses inflicted on the Taborites and Orphans at Lipany and the death, in that battle, of most of their leaders left the way clear for a settlement between the victorious Utraquists, on the one side, and Sigismund and the Council of Basel, on the other. The agreement achieved between the moderates and the Council's representatives in Prague during the winter of 1433-4 served as a basis for the Compacts of Jihlava (Iglau) which were finally concluded in July 1436. The chief feature of the Compacts was the concession of communion in both kinds for the Bohemian and Moravian laity, as envisaged in the earlier agreement. At last, in August 1436, Sigismund was able to enter Prague recognised by the Bohemians as their king.

IV

On folio 78^b of this manuscript, Frome's letter is followed by a list of nine cardinals who are described as resident at the Council.⁸⁹ Although this was not necessarily part of Frome's letter, it may have formed a post-script to it. All these cardinals can be shown to have been in Basel approximately at the time the letter was written.⁹⁰ They were all visited by the members of the English delegation within a few days of the latter's arrival early in August 1434.⁹¹ The cardinals who appear in the list sometimes with their correct titles and sometimes with their more popular names, can be identified, in the order in which they are named in the manuscript, as follows:

Nicholas Albergati, bishop of Bologna, whose title was 'Sancte Crucis in Hierosolyma';

Julian Cesarini, deacon; title: 'Sancti Angeli';⁹²

Anthony Correr, bishop of the suburbicarian see of Ostia and Velletri, formerly bishop of Bologna, hence the name 'Bononiensis';

Branda da Castiglione, bishop of the suburbicarian see of Porto and Santa Rufina; title: 'Sancti Clementis'; formerly bishop of Piacenza, hence 'Placentinus';

⁸⁸ *Concilium Basiliense*, III, pp. 116, 117; V, pp. 93-4.

⁸⁹ *Infra*, p. 331.

⁹⁰ *Concilium Basiliense*, III, pp. 1-281 *passim*.

⁹¹ Zellfelder, pp. 256-7.

⁹² Albergati and Cesarini are described as, respectively, first and second presidents of the Council. From 26 April 1434 when, following the ending of the pope's first quarrel with the Council, the papal legates were readmitted, the presidency of the Council was vested in several persons. The two cardinals with greatest seniority were respectively 'first' and 'second' presidents; P. Lazarus, *Das Basler Konzil: seine Berufung und Leitung, seine Gliederung und seine Behörden-organisation*, in *Historische Studien*, edited by E. Ebering, Berlin, 1896, etc.; c (1912), p. 95.

John de la Rochetaillée, archbishop of Besançon; title: 'Sancti Laurentii in Lucina'; formerly archbishop of Rouen, hence 'Rothomagensis';

Lewis Aleman, archbishop of Arles, hence 'Arelatensis'; title: 'Sancte Caeciliae';

John Cervantes, archdeacon of Seville; title: 'Sancti Petri ad vincula';

Hugh de Lusignan, bishop of Nicosia; title: 'Sancti Clementis'; known as 'of Cyprus';

Dominic Capranica, bishop of Fermo, hence 'Firmanus'; title: 'Sancte Mariae in via lata'.⁹³

V

The text of Trinity College, Cambridge, Western Manuscript 0.9.38, folios 77^a–78^b, is given below with extensions, punctuation and corrections added. The manuscript has suffered some damage, the pages having been worn at the outside edges and each one torn laterally about half way down. Most of the lacunae thus caused have been filled, in the version printed here, by the words or parts of words in square brackets; where the substitution is doubtful, this is indicated by the use of italics within the brackets; a few words which the copyist seems to have omitted have also been supplied in the latter way but with an additional indication in the footnotes.

The dimensions of the manuscript, which is of paper, are 11 $\frac{7}{8}$ × 4 $\frac{3}{8}$ inches.

Carissimis confratribus suis ... et Ricardo Busard' monachis monasterii G[lastoniensis].

Nota quod omnes barones et nobiles Bohemie et marchionatus Moravie nuper post Pascha c[irca] quartam ebdomadam, sencientes

5. se subiectos per plebes et infimos populos heresi ista nefanda percussos, convenerunt in unum et ducem Austrie Albertum adierunt cui quidam ex eis fidelitate[m] iurarunt; quidam autem ex eis arbitrati sunt n[on] esse tutum talem fidelitatem iurare pro tunc qu[od] si iuramentum perciperetur a vulgo indocto, populi civitatum et
10. oppidorum difficiliores se redderent [ad]¹ pacem minusque confiderent in ipsis baronibus dum cum ipsis tractarent; quare magis eis videbatur accommodum pro pace procuranda treugas unire ad tempus, quod eciam factum est. Ceterum vero ipsi barones in vigilia Ascensionis se invi[ce]m² congregantes in campo de mane
15. iurarunt mutuo se non deficere usque ad mortem inclusive donec populum legi dei, ecclesie et hominum tam rebell[em] predictis

⁹³ For further information about these cardinals, see: C. Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica Medii Aevi*, Munster etc., 1901–52, I, (2nd ed. 1913) and II (1901); *Dictionnaire des Cardinaux*, published by l'Abbe J. P. Migne, Paris, 1857.

¹ Omitted in MS.

² Or 'invi[si]'.

- legibus subicerent ac hereticos Taboritas Orphanos et Communicantes sub utraque interficerent, perimerent, aut in exilium mitterent. Unde [*in die*] Ascensionis domini hora quasi meridiana ingress[i] sunt]
20. Pragam veterem, habita prius bona fide cum c[ivibus] eiusdem civitatis secretissime tamen servata [*et*] sumpta modica recreacione, statim ante horam se[xtam] cum civibus ingressi sunt isti domini barones civitat[em] Pragensem novam, singulare habitaculum et speciale[m] nidum hereticorum. Non tamen ita caute ista fact[a]
25. sunt quin ad aurem quorundam istorum hereticorum perveniret horum dominorum propositum. Sed tam subito irru[erunt] domini barones et cives predicti in illam civitatem nov[am] ut in foribus essent civitatis antequam portas possent claudere. Quod videns Procopius Rasmus, rector in spiritualibus Taboritarum, statim fugit
30. cum quatuordecim equis. Christi militibus iam portas occupantibus, nullus post eos evadere poterat. Quod videntes alii incole heretici ceperunt ascendere pretorium et domos forciores civitatis illius, pluribus hinc inde in plateis alternis³ sanguinibus balneatis. [f. 77^b] Aliis flumen petentibus et in eodem submersis, paucissimis ad aliud
35. litus pervenientibus; sed his dominis baronibus a cede non cessantibus, interfecti sunt senes cum iunioribus, mulieres cum pueris. Inter quos interfectus est Lupus, sacerdos eorum, potissimus heresiarcha et impeditor per suas predicationes omnis pacis et concordie inter ecclesiam et illos. Videntes autem domini barones quod tantus
40. hereticorum populos domos fortissimas occuparant et se laborabant defendere, posuerunt ignem ad pretorium quod forcius erat et quosdam combusserunt; quidam se precipitaverunt; alii autem exeuntes se reddiderunt; ex quibus capitales statim mortui sunt gladio et aliis bellicis; et alii carceribus mancipati sunt et sic factum [est]⁴ de
45. singulis qui alias domos reciperent pro suis foetaliciis;⁵ modo quoque isto liberata est civitas ista a malis habitatoribus. Et nobiles domini barones, fideles milites, ipsam inhabitant. Hec vero audientes, exercitus Boemiorum in numero decem milium, qui iam per undecim menses oppidum quoddam Boemie dictum [Pi]lznam obsiderant,
50. statim combustis tentoriis et aliis defensionibus ligneis quibus se ab insultibus oppidanorum defenderant, recesserunt sine ordine ut homines confusi et devicti. Et si affuissent de [exter]nis vicis CC equestres, plurimos de exercitu, ut creditur, prostrassent. Sed illi cives obsessi duos dumtaxat equos habuerunt infra civitatem. Cives
55. isti semper manserunt fideles tanto tempore huius gravissime persecucionis. Et venientes ex hereticis ad eos ut suam heresim predicarent, quosdam igni tradiderunt, quosdam amputatis manibus et erutis oculis et [ad]⁶ suos patriarchales hereticos remiserunt. Racione cuius facti heretici acrius eos invaserunt erantque eis magis infesti
60. ignem minantes et mortem. Sed deus misertus est populi sui et ipsos

³ Or 'alterius'.⁴ Omitted in MS.⁵ Sic in MS. perhaps for 'fodalicis' (i.e., 'foedalicis') or 'sodalicis'; another possibility is 'fortalicis'.⁶ Omitted in MS.

- per undecim menses adiuvit ut in omnibus insultibus cotidianis non sint ex omnibus oppidanis sex mortui. Pluribus ex hereticis prostratis et tandem die secunda dominica [f. 78^a] post Ascensionem domini placuit altissimo eos [*liberare*] de manibus inimicorum. Acta sunt hec
65. sive ista ... anno domini millesimo CCCC^{mo} XXXIII^o⁷ circa festum Ascensionis domini prout superius annotatur et relata, ver[o], coram toto consilio Basiliensi in congregacione generali die vicesima octava Maii per reverendum magistrum dominum Johannem de Pallamore,⁸ auditorem curie apostoli[ce] et tunc legatum circa
70. partes Boemie ex parte consilii sacri predicti.

- Et cognoscant vestre benevole fraternitates quod nova habuimus in scriptis in Colonia in die sanctor[um] Primi et Feliciani ubi per octo dies exspectavi[mus] dominos subsequentes. Ad quam civitatem accedentes XL miliaria, propter guerras inter ducem Guldrie [*et*]
75. ducem Montensem fuimus in tanto periculo positi [*ut*] oporteret nos post deum confidere in archibus et sag[ittis], non obstantibus salvis conductibus vivis et mortui[s]. Spem tamen posuimus, ponimus et ponemus in suffra[gio] sanctorum ecclesie nostre et vestris oracionibus specialem per q[ue], deo duce, salvi et incolumes preservamur,
80. quomodo revertemur simpliciter ignorantes si non deus, [*fons*] solacii, aliter disponet pro nobis. [*Novem cardina*]les sunt in consilio. Dominus Imperator est [*in urbe*] que vocatur Ulma super flumen Danubii. [*Maximus*] pontifex est in Roma. Et si nostri domini superv[enissent] nos fuisset in consilio vel prope, deo duce, a[d]⁹ datum presencium.
85. Ubi pluribus cognitis et auditis posse[mus] dominos nostros et vos de novis contingentibus redder[e] cerciores. Et quantum ad illa pertinet retrahimu[s] calamum. Cum salute intimis cordis nostri affectibus desiderantes ut sancta religio quam in exitu nost[ro] pro tempore nostre absencie benevole promisistis ad honorem dei et
90. profectum animarumstrarum continue conval[es]cat et in gaudium amicorum et obprobrium malignancium c ... tum¹⁰ mediis pacis et caritatis in dies augmentetur. Et de singulis pertinentibus ad gubernacionem ecclesie exterius simpliciter confidimus in habentibus potestatem. Et, si que fuerint inter vos nobis transmittenda in pos-
95. terum, [f. 78^b] [*mittantu*]r primo London' ad Alexandrum de Albertinis ... eius; eorum nuncii tempore guerre securius pertransibunt. [*Sed*] de singulis peragendis vestris ocupacionibus, presupposita sanitate, non intendimus vos per nostras litteras fatigare. Et si dominus meus singularissimus dominus Bathoniensis vel dominus de
100. Hungerford' ad vos declinaverint, ostendatis eis vultum secundum ultimum potencie vestre. Et si maiores supervenerint pro consilio habendo mittatis ad dominum de Hungerford' quam cito poteritis. Et salutetis merito salutandis. Et valeatis sicut nos vellemus valere nos ipsos in corpore et anima vel toto composito. Scripta apud

⁷ Recte 'XXXIII^o'.

⁸ I.e., Palomar.

⁹ Or 'a[n]te'.

¹⁰ 'certum'?

105. Coloniam in die Primi et Feliciani, per Nicholaum Abbatem Glastoniensem.

Hec sunt nomina cardinalium residencium in consilio.
 Cardinalis Sante [Crucis],¹¹ primus presidens,
 Cardinalis Sancti Angeli, secundus presidens et legatus,

110. Cardinalis Bononiensis,
 Cardinalis Placentinus,
 Cardinalis Rotomagensis,
 Cardinalis Arelatensis,
 Cardinalis Sancti Petri ad vincula,
 115. Cardinalis Cipri,
 Cardinalis Firmanus

¹¹ Omitted in MS.